

SUBSECTION 8.8

Socioeconomics

8.8 Socioeconomics

8.8.1 Introduction

This section discusses the environmental setting, consequences, regional and local impacts, and mitigation measures associated with the socioeconomic aspects of the CVEC project. Section 8.8.2 presents the laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) applicable to socioeconomic. Section 8.8.3 describes the environment that may be affected by CVEC construction and operation. Section 8.8.4 identifies environmental impacts from development of the power plant, and Section 8.8.5 discusses cumulative impacts. Environmental justice issues are discussed in Section 8.8.6. Mitigation measures are discussed in Section 8.8.7. Section 8.8.8 presents the agencies involved and provides agency contacts. Section 8.8.9 presents the required permits and permitting schedule. Section 8.8.10 provides references used to prepare this section.

The CVEC project will be located in the southeast part of the City of San Joaquin, California, southwest of Colorado Avenue. The City of San Joaquin is a farming community, located 30 miles west of Fresno. For this project, the region of influence is the County of Fresno.

Though the CVEC site is in the City of San Joaquin, the transmission line, water line, and gas line corridors cross unincorporated areas of Fresno County. Land use in the vicinity is irrigated and non-irrigated agricultural, light industry and warehousing, railroad tracks and an irrigation canal. Rural residential uses and urban land uses are located to the north and west of the site.

8.8.2 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards

8.8.2.1 Federal

A summary of the LORS, including the project's conformance to them, is presented in Table 8.8-1.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, 78 Stat. 241 (codified as amended in various sections of 42 U.S.C.) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin by all federal agencies or activities receiving federal financial assistance.

Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice (EJ) in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," requires USEPA and other federal agencies to identify and address whether adverse human health or environmental effects are likely to fall disproportionately on minority and/or low-income members of the community. Applies only to federal agencies, not agencies receiving federal funds.

8.8.2.2 State

Government Code Sections 65996 and 65997, provide the exclusive methods of considering and mitigating impacts on school facilities that might occur as a result of the development of real property.

Education Code Section 17620, listed in Government Code Section 65997 as an approved mitigation method, allows school districts to levy a fee or other requirement against any construction within the boundaries of the school district for the purpose of funding construction of school facilities.

TABLE 8.8-1

Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards Applicable to CVEC Socioeconomics

LORS	Purpose	Applicability	Conformance
Federal			
Civil Rights Act of 1964	Prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.	Applies to all federal agencies and agencies receiving federal funds.	Section 8.8.5
Executive Order 12898	Avoid disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income members of the community.	Applies only to federal agencies. Does not apply to agencies receiving federal funds.	Section 8.8.5
State			
Government Code Sections 65996-65997	Establishes that the levy of a fee for construction of an industrial facility be considered mitigating impacts on school facilities.	Golden Plains Unified School District may charge a one-time assessment fee to mitigate potential school impacts.	Section 8.8.6
Education Code Section 17620	Allows a school district to levy a fee against any construction within the boundaries of the district for the purpose of funding construction of school facilities.	Golden Plains Unified School District may charge a one-time assessment fee to mitigate potential school impacts.	Section 8.8.6
Local			
County General Plan, Economic Development Element	To increase job creation.	Encourages industry to locate in the County to create jobs and reduce unemployment	Sections 8.8.2.3, 8.8.3.3, 8.8.3.4
County General Plan, Public Facilities and Service Element	To facilitate the efficient provision of necessary services and minimize impacts of utilities on surrounding land uses.	Encourages the location of cost-effective utilities to serve existing and future needs.	Sections 8.8.2.1, 8.8.2.3, 8.8.3.3, 8.8.3.4

8.8.2.3 Local**8.8.2.3.1 Fresno County**

Fresno County General Plan (January 2000) has several elements that relate to various portions of the socioeconomic analysis. These include an Economic Development Element and a Public Facilities and Services Element. Relevant portions include:

Policy ED-A.8a

The County shall encourage the location of new industry within cities, and unincorporated communities.

Policy PF-J.1

The County shall provide adequate gas and electric, communications, and telecommunications services and facilities to serve existing and future needs.

Policy PF-J.2

The County shall work with local gas and electric utility companies to design and locate appropriate expansion of gas and electric systems, while minimizing impacts to agriculture and minimizing noise, electromagnetic, visual, and other impacts on existing and future residents.

8.8.3 Affected Environment

8.8.3.1 Population

Fresno County, a predominantly agricultural county, is located in the fertile, well-populated Central Valley. Fresno County is bordered on the west by the Diablo Mountain Range, on the north by the San Joaquin River, and on the east by the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Incorporated cities in Fresno County include Clovis, Coalinga, Firebaugh, Fowler, Fresno, Huron, Kerman, Kingsburg, Mendota, Orange Cove, Parlier, Reedley, Sanger, San Joaquin and Selma.

Historical population data for the City of San Joaquin and Fresno County are summarized in Table 8.8-2. Annual average compounded population growth rates are summarized in Table 8.8-3. During the 1990s, Fresno County's population increased at an average annual rate of 1.89 percent, while that of the City of San Joaquin increased by 3.48 percent (DOF, 2001). In both cases, the growth was greater during the first half of the decade.

TABLE 8.8-2
Historical and Projected Populations^a

Area	1990	1995	2000	2005 (p)	2010 (p)	2015(p)
City of San Joaquin	2,300	2,800	3,300	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fresno County	667,500	746,500	805,000	881,200	953,500	1,024,300
California	29,942,400	32,062,900	34,653,400	37,372,400	39,957,600	45,448,600

Source: Department of Finance (DOF), 2001.

^a Populations rounded to nearest 100.

(p) projected
N/A not available

TABLE 8.8-3
Historical and Projected Annual Average Compounded Population Growth Rates

Area	1990-1995 Percent	1995-2000 Percent	2000-2005 Percent	2005-2010 Percent	2010-2015 Percent
City of San Joaquin	3.97	2.02	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fresno County	2.26	1.52	1.83	1.59	1.44
California	1.38	1.57	1.52	1.35	2.61

Source: CH2M HILL.

Tables 8.8-4 and 8.8-5 show the ethnic and income distribution, respectively, for the Census Tracts that are within a 6-mile radius of CVEC. The minority data in Table 8.8-4 is from the 2000 U.S. Census data, which was released in April 2001. The income data from the 2000 Census is not expected to be available until April 2002. Therefore, the 1990 Census data was used. The area is relatively rural; therefore, only portions of these three census tracts are within the 6-mile radius. Census Tract 8200 comprises almost half of the land area and contains a minority population of 60 percent. The same census tract has the highest percentage of low-income population at 29.3 percent. Using the 2000 Census Blocks to more accurately portray those within the 6-mile radius, the minority population is approximately 63 percent. Similarly, using the 1990 Census Block Group to more accurately portray those within the 6-mile radius, the low-income population is approximately 29 percent. (See Appendix 8.8A for more information on demographics at the smaller Block Group and Block levels.).

TABLE 8.8-4
Distribution of Minority Population by Census Tracts Within a 6-Mile Radius

Census Tract	Population	White	Minority	Percent Minority
06019008200	7,463	2,987	4,476	60.0
06019007600	4,469	2,303	2,166	48.5
06019003900	5,503	2,829	2,674	48.6
TOTAL	17,435	8,119	9,316	53.4

Source: 2000 Census.

TABLE 8.8-5
Distribution of Low-Income Population by Census Tracts Within a 6-Mile Radius

Census Tract	Poverty ^a	Poverty Universe ^a	Percent Low-Income
06019008200	1,716	5,853	29.3
06019007600	906	4,532	20.0
06019003900	1,475	5,358	27.5
TOTAL	4,097	15,743	26.0

Source: 1990 Census.

^a Poverty numbers exclude full-time college students.

8.8.3.2 Housing

As shown in Table 8.8-6, housing stock for Fresno County as of January 1, 2000, was 273,159 units. Single-family homes accounted for 184,381 units, multiple family dwellings accounted for 75,082 units, and mobile homes accounted for 13,696 units. New housing authorizations for Fresno County in 1999 totaled 3,032 units; about 90 percent were single-family units and 10 percent were multi-family units. These authorizations were valued at \$378.8 million (DOF, 2001). In February 2001, the median home price in Fresno County was \$89,000 (Palada, 2001). Fresno County's vacancy rate did not change significantly between 1990 and 2000 (from 6.2 percent to 6.1 percent). Since the vacancy rate is higher than the federal standard of 5 percent, it indicates that housing within the County is not in short supply.

TABLE 8.8-6
Housing Estimates by City and County, January 1, 2000

Area	Total Units	Single Family	Multi-family	Mobile Homes	Percent Vacant
City of San Joaquin	766	510	203	53	2.48
Fresno County	273,159	184,381	75,082	13,696	6.10
California	12,242,576	7,694,494	3,962,986	585,096	7.41

Source: DOF, 2001.

The City of San Joaquin has a vacancy rate about half the federal 5 percent standard. Since it is a small community, this means that housing supply only slightly exceeds housing demand. If additional demand were created, it is likely that new homes would need to be built to accommodate the increased demand.

8.8.3.3 Economy and Employment

Between 1996 and 1999, employment in Fresno County increased by 9,800 jobs or about 3 percent. This 3 percent increase is far less than California's net increase (9.5 percent) during that same period (CEDD, 2001a). As shown in Table 8.8-7, construction and mining, services, and government experienced the largest increases in employment. Although employment in construction and mining increased substantially between 1996 and 1999, the contribution of this sector to the Fresno County economy remained relatively small. Employment losses were experienced in agriculture and the transportation and utilities sectors.

TABLE 8.8-7
Employment Distribution in Fresno County, 1996 to 1999

Industry	1996		1999		1996-1999	
	Number of Employees	Employment Share (%)	Number of Employees	Employment Share (%)	Percentage Change (%)	Average Annual Compound Growth Rate (%)
Agriculture	62,000	20	57,100	18	-8	-2.7
Construction, Mining	12,400	4	14,800	5	19	6.1
Manufacturing	26,400	9	27,600	9	5	1.5
Transportation, Utilities	12,600	4	12,500	4	-1	-0.3
Wholesale trade	13,900	5	14,500	5	4	1.4
Retail trade	46,500	15	48,800	15	5	1.6
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	13,600	4	13,800	4	1	0.5
Services	63,100	20	67,900	21	8	2.5
Government	58,300	19	61,600	19	6	1.9
Total Employment	308,800	100	318,600	100	3	1.0

Source: CEDD, 2001a.

Table 8.8-8 provides more detail on the characteristics of the County labor force. It shows 1999 employment data for Fresno County and the City of San Joaquin compared to California. Both Fresno County and the City of San Joaquin have unemployment rates that are significantly greater than the state average. The unemployment rate in the City of San Joaquin (33.4 percent) is one of the highest in the state. CEDD does not project future unemployment rates.

TABLE 8.8-8
Employment Data, 1999

Area	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment	Unemployment Rate (%)
City of San Joaquin	1,170	780	390	33.4
Fresno County	380,200	329,100	51,100	13.4
California	16,596,500	15,731,700	864,800	5.2

Source: CEDD, 2001a.

8.8.3.4 Fiscal Resources

The local agencies with taxing power include Fresno County and the City of San Joaquin. Fresno County's General Fund expenditures and revenues are presented in Table 8.8-9. The County's General Fund has shown steady growth from year-to-year. From FY 1998 to FY 1999, General Fund revenues grew 9.8 percent. In FY 2000, the revenues continued to grow just more than 10 percent. Revenue from property taxes comprises between 5 and 6 percent of the County's total General Fund revenue.

TABLE 8.8-9
Fresno County Revenues and Expenditures by Fund (\$ Million)

	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Projected FY 2001 ^a
Expenditures				
General	\$63.2	\$70.8	\$118.9	\$65.95
Public Protection	\$198.8	\$198.5	\$221.0	\$248.6
Public Ways and Facilities	\$31.0	\$35.7	\$48.4	\$57.9
Health and Sanitation	\$321.6	\$338.9	\$383.1	\$529.8
Public Assistance	\$292.2	\$309.5	\$355.4	\$228.1
Education	\$8.8	\$13.9	\$23.9	\$26.4
Recreational and Cultural	\$2.4	\$2.5	\$3.2	\$3.4
Appropriations for Contingencies - General			\$1.4	\$1.0
Provision for Reserves and Designations			\$11.2	\$9.0
Total Expenditures	\$917.9	\$969.8	\$1,166.4	\$1,170.0
Revenues				
Taxes – Current Property	\$53.1	\$57.2	\$54.9	\$55.7
Taxes – Other than Current Property	\$22.2	\$40.3	\$31.6	\$32.2
Licenses, Permits, Franchises	\$5.4	\$5.9	\$5.8	\$6.1
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	\$6.8	\$9.6	\$8.1	\$10.1
Revenue from Use of Money/Property	\$14.0	\$12.8	\$8.9	\$8.2
Intergovernmental Revenues - State	\$294.3	\$345.8	\$390.5	\$426.8
Intergovernmental Revenues - Federal	\$207.0	\$192.9	\$218.3	\$233.8
Intergovernmental Revenues - Other	\$2.4	\$3.4	\$3.1	\$3.5
Charges for Services	\$64.4	\$81.4	\$88.6	\$98.6
Miscellaneous Revenues	\$38.0	\$49.3	\$51.0	\$26.6
Other Financing Sources	\$138.4	\$149.4	\$154.4	\$162.8

TABLE 8.8-9
Fresno County Revenues and Expenditures by Fund (\$ Million)

	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Projected FY 2001 ^a
Residual Equity Transfers In	\$11.1	\$2.6	\$27.5	\$5.0
Intrafund Revenue	\$54.7	\$51.2	\$60.9	\$62.8
Teeter Funds	\$0.7			
Total Revenue	\$912.5	\$1,001.8	\$1,103.6	\$1,132.2

Source: Fresno County, 2001.

Numbers may not add up due to independent rounding.

^a Not yet adopted.

As shown in Table 8.8-10, the General Fund revenue for the City of San Joaquin has been erratic. In FY 1998-99, the City experienced its greatest General Fund revenue of the past 3 years, with total revenue of \$965,931. The next year saw a sharp decline in the revenue budget, dropping about 30 percent to \$667,062. The large drop is primarily attributed to a 46 percent drop in revenues from Current Service Charges and a 64 percent drop in revenue from the Other Revenue category. Significant reductions in the Licenses, Permits, and Franchises category, Fines and Forfeitures category, and Revenue from Use of Money and Property category were also experienced. During the current fiscal year, total General Fund revenues are expected to increase from last fiscal year by 6.8 percent, with the largest growth expected in the Current Service Charge category. However, revenues in that category still were less than levels 3 years ago. During FY 2000-01, the Other Revenue category is showing continued decline with an 86.7 percent drop from last year's budget and a 95 percent reduction from the \$170,000 level experienced in FY 1998-99. Property taxes comprise about 5 percent of the total General Fund revenue. The City projects its revenues to drop in FY 2001-02 due to a combination of conservative budgeting, improved accounting, reduced staff, and the exclusion of back fees. FY 2001-02 budget is based on the actual (not budgeted) revenues and expenditures from FY 2000-01 (Hami, 2001).

TABLE 8.8-10
City of San Joaquin General Fund Revenues and Expenditures

	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	Projected 2001-02
Expenditures				
Fees & Charges (40100 – 40500)	\$24,900	\$19,190	\$12,550	\$27,700
Contract Services (40600)	\$140,000	\$130,000	\$275,000	\$111,000
Contributions, Dues & Subscriptions (40700 – 40900)	\$2,700	\$2,864	\$2,605	\$2,500
Employee Benefits	\$46,550	\$56,422	\$21,500	\$30,000
Engineering Fees	\$11,000	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Food	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,400
Gas, Oil & Lube	\$3,700	\$4,000	\$2,580	\$2,100
Grants, Insurance, & Interest	\$18,307	\$10,000	\$16,920	\$30,900
Janitorial	\$2,200	\$2,108	\$2,500	\$2,000
Lease Payments	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$33,530	\$33,500

TABLE 8.8-10
City of San Joaquin General Fund Revenues and Expenditures

	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	Projected 2001-02
Legal Fees	\$42,800	\$28,000	\$18,650	\$18,000
Misc., Office Supplies, Professional Fees	\$58,000	\$42,888	\$21,025	\$22,900
Principal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,500
Rents, Repair & Maintenance	\$10,900	\$10,560	\$5,800	\$11,000
Salaries	\$198,700	\$247,100	\$170,600	\$160,000
Supplies, Telephone	\$15,500	\$14,593	\$10,540	\$12,500
Transfer Out	\$0	\$0	\$63,000	\$0
Travel	\$6,900	\$9,502	\$1,250	\$1,200
Utilities	\$15,000	\$12,261	\$9,680	\$15,000
Improvements	0	\$10,000	\$1,000	\$0
Machinery/Equipment & Rental	\$15,870	\$10,947	\$1,250	\$8,000
Total Expenditures	\$648,027	\$665,435	674,980	\$504,200
Revenues				
Property Taxes	\$47,950	\$39,560	\$33,995	\$42,000
Other Taxes	\$175,100	\$175,033	\$186,750	\$176,815
Licenses, Permits, Franchises	\$113,750	\$87,636	\$47,320	\$38,450
Fines and Forfeitures	\$16,000	\$9,705	\$9,500	\$10,500
Revenue from Use of Money/Property	\$23,000	\$14,906	\$10,800	\$17,800
Intergovernmental Revenues	\$131,131	\$124,717	\$147,950	\$240,000
Current Service Charges	\$289,000	\$155,548	\$268,020	\$4,000
Other Revenue	\$170,000	\$59,959	\$8,000	\$69,600
Other Financing Sources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Revenue	\$965,931	\$667,062	\$712,335	\$599,165

Source: Fresno County, 2001.
Numbers may not add up due to independent rounding.

8.8.3.5 Education

There are a total of 35 elementary, high school, and unified school districts in Fresno County. The CVEC site is in the Golden Plains Unified School District. Current as well as projected enrollment figures for the school district are presented in Table 8.8-11.

TABLE 8.8-11
Current and Projected Enrollment by Grade

Grade Level	Golden Plains Unified School District		
	Current Enrollment (2000-01)	Projected Enrollment (2001-02)	Change in Enrollment
Kindergarten	154	149	-5
First	172	153	-19
Second	173	173	0
Third	154	172	18
Fourth	170	152	-18
Fifth	156	170	14
Sixth	150	156	6
Seventh	147	150	3
Eighth	140	147	7
Ninth	158	140	-18
Tenth	152	158	6
Eleventh	141	152	11
Twelfth	141	141	0
TOTAL	2,008	2,013	5

Source: Gonzalez, M., 2001.

8.8.3.6 Public Services and Facilities

This section describes public services in the project area.

8.8.3.6.1 Law Enforcement

The Fresno County Sheriff's Office is headquartered at 2200 Fresno St. in Fresno. The proposed CVEC project site comes under the jurisdiction of Area 1 of the Fresno County Sheriff's Department and is located at 21925 W. Manning in the City of San Joaquin. This station serves a number of small cities and the unincorporated areas in western Fresno County. There are 31 deputies, 5 sergeants, 1 office assistant, 7 to 8 community service officers (with a similar number of officers dedicated as school resource officers), a detective unit composed of 3 deputies and a sergeant, and the Area Commander (Huerta, 2001). There are 15 patrol cars all equipped with computers, bubble printers, and scanners. All 911 calls are received and processed through the headquarters in Fresno where they are dispatched (via a computer-aided-dispatch system) to patrol units on the ground. Since the proposed site is between half a mile to a mile from the Area 1 Substation on W. Manning, response time to an emergency from CVEC site is expected to be no more than 3 to 5 minutes (Huerta, 2001).

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) is the primary law enforcement agency for state highways and roads. Services include law enforcement, traffic control, accident investigation, and the management of hazardous materials spill incidents.

8.8.3.6.2 Fire Protection

The CVEC site is within the Fresno County Fire Protection District (FCFPD) jurisdiction. The FCFPD Station No. 95 at 25101 W. Morton Avenue in Tranquillity serves the City of San Joaquin and is the nearest station to CVEC site. Station No. 95 will respond to a call from the site in approximately 8 to 12 minutes. Station No. 95 has one fire engine staffed by 2 firefighters 24 hours a

day, 7 days a week. It also has a 3,000 gallon water tender operated by on-call firefighters. There is a 1,200 gallon-per-minute engine in the City of San Joaquin that is administered by the FCFPD and is run by on-call firefighters. Station No. 95 relies on the assistance of Station No. 96 located at 101 McCabe Avenue in Mendota and Station No. 90 located at 2701 W. Tahoe Street in Caruthers. The Mendota Station has one engine staffed by two firefighters and a reserve city engine staffed by volunteers or on-call firefighters. The Caruthers station has one engine staffed by 2 firefighters and a water tender staffed by on-call firefighters (Williams, 2001).

8.8.3.6.3 Emergency Response

The County does not have a Hazardous Materials Team to respond to spills. The FCFPD firefighters can be called upon to help with the identification and confinement of any possible spills (i.e., anhydrous ammonia). They will also spearhead any evacuation efforts. The FCFPD defers any clean-up efforts to the facility and private clean-up companies hired by the particular facility to do such work (Williams, 2001). The response time to an emergency call from CVEC site is 8 to 12 minutes.

8.8.3.6.4 Hospitals

There are 7 hospitals with emergency rooms in the City of Fresno. The Community Medical Center has 3 acute facilities: University Medical Center (334 beds), Community Medical Center – Fresno (416 beds), and Community Medical Center – Clovis (100 beds). The three Community Medical Centers have a combined staff of 5407 and 192 residents. Additionally, there are 959 physicians associated with the hospitals. University Medical Center, located at 445 S. Cedar Ave in Fresno, is a 334-bed, full-service, primary care medical facility. University Medical Center is the only hospital with an adult trauma center in Fresno County. It is also the regional adult trauma center for the Central Valley, serving areas from Sacramento to Bakersfield. Specialty services at the hospital include Trauma Center, Level I; Burn Center; Leon Peters Rehabilitation Center; High Risk Maternity Program; Cardiac Intensive Care Unit; Intensive Care Unit; Neonatal Intensive Care Unit; Asthma Management and Education; and Critical Care. University also has a Life Flight system.

The other hospitals with Emergency Rooms (ERs) are Pediatrics Plus, VA Central CA Health, St. Agnes, and Kaiser. Both Kaiser and St. Agnes are primary care facilities with a Life Flight system.

8.8.3.7 Utilities

This section describes utilities in the area.

8.8.3.7.1 Electricity and Gas

The project will interconnect to PG&E's electrical distribution system via PG&E's Helm substation, which is located on a parcel to the south of the project site. Gas will be delivered by PG&E from its distribution system. Both systems have adequate capacity to serve the project. Gas supply is described in Chapter 6.

8.8.3.7.2 Water

Plant utility water will be supplied from the Fresno-Clovis WWTF. This facility is located approximately 17 miles to the northeast of the project site. Potable water will be provided from the City of San Joaquin. The water supply plan is described in Chapter 7.0.

8.8.3.7.3 Sewer

Process wastewater will be reclaimed and reused through use of a zero-discharge treatment system. The resulting waste will be disposed of offsite in accordance with federal, state and local requirements. Domestic sanitary sewage will be managed by the City of San Joaquin. The City has adequate capacity as demonstrated by a "will-serve" letter (Appendix 8.14A).

8.8.4 Environmental Consequences

This section assesses the potential environmental impacts of the project and linears.

8.8.4.1 Potential Environmental Impacts

Local environmental impacts were determined by comparing project demands during construction and operation with the socioeconomic resources of the project area (i.e., Fresno County). A proposed power generating facility could impact employment, population, housing, public services and utilities, and/or schools. Impacts could be local and/or regional, though most impacts would tend to be more regional than local. It is anticipated that the project will not have any significant adverse impacts on the socioeconomic environment, but it will have significant socioeconomic benefits to the local community.

8.8.4.2 Significance Criteria

The criteria used to determine the significance of project-related socioeconomic impacts are as suggested in the CEQA Checklist. Project-related impacts are determined to be significant if they:

- Induce substantial growth or concentration of population
- Displace a large number of people or existing housing
- Result in substantial adverse environmental impacts associated with the provision of utility services
- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public services

Other impacts may be significant if they cause substantial change in community interaction patterns, social organization, social structures, or social institutions; substantial conflict with community attitudes, values, or perceptions; or substantial inequities in the distribution of project cost and benefit.

8.8.4.3 Construction Impacts

Actual construction will take place over approximately 22-28 months, from third quarter 2002 to third quarter 2004. Personnel requirements will be minimal during the mobilization and site grading period (i.e., during the first 3 months of the construction period) and during the startup and testing period (i.e., during the last 3 months of the construction period).

8.8.4.3.1 Construction Workforce

The primary trades in demand will include boilermakers, carpenters, electricians, ironworkers, laborers, millwrights, operators, and pipefitters. Table 8.8-12 provides an estimate of construction personnel requirements for the plant and linear facilities. Total construction personnel requirements during construction will be approximately 7,353 person-months, or 613 person-years. Construction personnel requirements will peak at approximately 605 workers in month 17 of the construction period. However, the peak construction workforce for the plant is estimated to be 385 workers in month 15.

Available skilled labor in the Fresno County was evaluated by surveying the Building and Trades Council (Table 8.8-13) and contacting CEDD (Table 8.8-14). Both sources show that the workforce in Fresno County will be adequate to fulfill CVEC's labor requirements for construction. Therefore, CVEC construction will not place an undue burden on the local workforce. In addition, as shown in Table 8.8-7, the mining and construction workforce within the County has been growing at an average annual rate of 5 percent per year. Thus, if growth continues at this rate, CVEC is not likely to result in a significant construction impact.

TABLE 8.8-12
Construction Personnel by Month

Discipline	Months After Notice-to-Proceed																										Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26		
Plant																												
Insulation Workers												6	10	18	20	20	24	24	24	32	28	18	12					236
Boilermakers								10	20	22	34	36	42	52	58	58	58	57	48	40	15	6						556
Bricklayers/Masons			2	6	6	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1							50
Carpenters		6	10	12	10	12	14	16	14	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	5	4	4	4	4	2	2	1				174
Electricians		4	5	6	8	14	20	26	32	35	49	60	64	66	66	66	66	64	62	58	40	24	16	7				858
Ironworkers		4	5	10	10	18	18	22	25	25	28	30	28	30	30	28	24	22	20	18	16	8						419
Laborers	3	4	11	15	12	10	15	15	13	18	22	22	22	22	22	22	30	28	26	22	15	15	7	4	4			399
Millwrights											13	19	26	40	40	40	38	36	32	28	8	8	1					329
Operating Engineers	3	6	6	6	6	6	10	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	10	8	8	4	4	1	1				199
Painters														4	4	4	8	8	8	8	4	4	2	2				56
Pipefitters			3	6	8	8	17	50	63	68	86	86	78	78	76	75	74	74	63	31	25	10	4	2				985
Sheetmetal Workers										3	6	8	8	9	8	8	8											58
Surveyors	4	4	2	2	2	2	2																					18
Teamsters	2	4	6	10	6	6	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1				93
Total Manual Staff	12	32	50	73	68	80	103	160	186	198	265	294	304	345	350	344	352	332	300	252	162	100	46	18	4			4,430
Total Contractor Staff	3	3	6	14	14	20	20	30	30	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	30	30	30	20	20	15	15	15	7	5		572
Total Plant Staff	15	35	56	87	82	100	123	190	216	233	300	329	339	380	385	379	382	362	330	272	182	115	61	33	11	5		5,002
Water Pipeline																												
Surveyors												2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2					26
Foremen/Supervisors												2	2	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6					64
Equipment Operators														22	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	22					364
Laborers														28	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	28					440
Teamsters														8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	4					76
Electrical																	2	3	3	2								10
Mechanical, equipment																1	2	2	1									6
Mechanical, piping																1	2	2	1									6
Well Drillers															3	3	3											9
Total Water Pipeline Staff											4	5	67	107	109	113	111	109	106	104	104	62						1,001

TABLE 8.8-12
Construction Personnel by Month

Discipline	Months After Notice-to-Proceed																										Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
Gas Pipeline																											
Surveyors												2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2				26
Foremen/Supervisors												2	2	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6				64
Equipment Operators														22	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	22				364
Laborers														28	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	28				440
Teamsters														8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	4				76
Electrical																	2	3	3	2							10
Mechanical, equipment																1	2	2	1								6
Mechanical, piping																1	2	2	1								6
Total Gas Pipeline Staff												4	5	67	104	106	110	111	109	106	104	104	62				992
Transmission Lines																											
Civil										6	4																10
Structural										8	8																16
Electrical														6													6
Misc (support labor)									1	2	2	2	1														8
Total Manual Staff								1	18	36	39	58	46	36	2												236
Total Contractor Staff								2	2	6	8	8	6	6	4												42
Total T-line Staff								3	20	43	63	80	60	43	6												318
TOTAL WORKFORCE	15	35	56	87	82	100	126	210	259	296	380	397	392	520	596	594	605	584	548	484	390	323	185	33	11	5	7,313

TABLE 8.8-13
Labor Union Contacts

Labor Union	Contact	Phone Number
Fresno, Madera, Tulare, Kings Building Trades Council	Fred Hardy	559-255-3079

TABLE 8.8-14
Available Labor by Skill in Fresno County, 1997 to 2004

Occupational Title	Annual Averages		Absolute Change	Percentage Change	Average Annual Compounded Growth Rate (%)
	1997	2004			
Carpenters	2,080	2,290	210	10.1	1.4
Masons	1,110	1,170	60	5.4	0.8
Painters	540	580	40	7.4	1.0
Metal Workers	280	290	10	3.6	0.5
Electricians	1,000	1,070	70	7.0	1.0
Welders	690	790	100	14.5	2.0
Excavators	120	140	20	16.7	2.2
Graders	150	160	10	6.7	0.9
Industrial Truck Operators	3,380	4,180	800	23.7	3.1
Operating Engineers	120	120	0	0	0
Helpers, Laborers	10,190	11,730	1,540	15.1	2.0
Pipefitters	740	780	40	5.4	0.8
Administrative Services Managers	800	900	100	12.5	1.7
Mechanical Engineers	180	220	40	22.2	2.9
Electrical Engineers	160	190	30	18.8	2.5
Engineering Technicians	1,440	1,640	200	13.9	1.9
Plant and System Operators	950	1,000	50	5.3	0.7

Source: CEDD, 2001.

8.8.4.3.2 Population Impacts

It is anticipated that most of the construction workforce will be drawn from Fresno County as well as Madera, Tulare, and Kings counties, if necessary. Most workers are expected to commute to the project site, and therefore will not contribute to an increase in the population of the area.

8.8.4.3.3 Housing Impacts

Most of the construction workforce will have to commute to the project site daily since there are no hotel/motel accommodations in the City of San Joaquin. However, there are 6,200 hotel/motel rooms

in the City of Fresno (Maggiore, 2001) that are available to accommodate workers from outside the area who may choose to commute to the project site on a workweek basis. The City of Fresno is a 30- to 45-minute drive from the City of San Joaquin. As a result, construction of the proposed project is not expected to increase the demand for housing in San Joaquin.

8.8.4.3.4 Impacts to the Local Economy and Employment

The cost of materials and supplies (excluding the CTGs, HRSGs, and most other large equipment) required by the project is estimated at \$250 million. The estimated value of materials and supplies that will be purchased locally during construction is \$5 to \$10 million.

CVEC will provide about \$60.9 million in construction payroll, at an average salary of \$50 per hour (including benefits). The anticipated payroll for employees, as well as the purchase of materials and supplies during the construction period, will have a slight beneficial impact on the area. Assuming, conservatively, that 60 percent of the construction workforce will reside in Fresno County, it is expected that approximately \$36.6 million will stay in the local area. These additional funds will cause a temporary beneficial impact by creating the potential for other employment opportunities for local workers in other service areas, such as transportation and retail.

Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts from Construction

Construction activity would result in secondary economic impacts (indirect and induced impacts) within Fresno County. Secondary employment effects would include indirect and induced employment due to the purchase of goods and services by firms involved with construction, and induced employment due to construction workers spending their income within the county. In addition to these secondary employment impacts, there are indirect and induced income effects arising from construction.

Indirect and induced impacts were estimated using an IMPLAN Input-Output model of Fresno County. IMPLAN is an economic modeling software program. The estimated indirect and induced employment within Fresno County would be 35 and 184 jobs, respectively. These additional jobs result from the \$5 million in annual local construction expenditures as well as the \$12.8 million in spending by local construction workers. The \$12.8 million represents the disposable portion of the annual construction payroll (here assumed to be 70% of \$18.3 million). Assuming an average direct construction employment of 305, the employment multiplier associated with the construction phase of the project is approximately 1.7 (i.e., $(305 + 35 + 184)/305$). This project construction phase employment multiplier is based on a Type SAM model.

Indirect and induced income impacts were estimated at \$901,476 and \$4,639,938, respectively. Assuming a total annual local construction expenditure (payroll, materials and supplies) of \$23.2 million (\$18.3 million in payroll + \$5 million in materials and supplies), the project construction phase income multiplier based on a Type SAM model is approximately 1.2 (i.e., $[\$23,282,500 + \$901,476 + \$4,639,938]/\$23,282,500$).

Assuming that annual local construction expenditures are \$2.5 million instead of \$5 million results in indirect and induced employment estimates within Fresno County of 17 and 180 jobs, respectively. Based on the same average construction employment of 305, the construction phase employment multiplier is approximately 1.7.

Indirect and induced income impacts based on the total annual construction expenditure of \$20.8 million (\$18.3 million in payroll + \$2.5 million in materials and supplies) were estimated at \$420,738 and \$4,540,577, respectively. Based on these estimates, the construction phase income multiplier was estimated at 1.2.

8.8.4.3.5 Fiscal Impacts

CVEC initial capital cost is estimated to be \$600 million; of this, materials and supplies are estimated at approximately \$250 million. The estimated value of materials and supplies that will be purchased locally (within Fresno County) during construction is between \$5 and \$10 million. The effect on fiscal resources during construction will be from sales taxes realized on equipment and materials purchased in the County and from sales taxes from expenditures. The sales tax rate in Fresno County is 7.625 percent (as of January 1, 2001). Of this, 5.75 percent goes to the state; 0.25 percent goes to the County; one percent goes to the place of sale; and 0.625 percent goes to the special districts (BOE, 2001). The total local sales tax expected to be generated during construction is \$381,000 to \$763,000 (i.e., 7.625 percent of local sales).

8.8.4.3.6 Impacts on Education

The schools in the Golden Plains Unified School District are currently not considered overcrowded. However, the school closest to the project site (the San Joaquin Elementary School) was almost overcrowded last year (Gonzales, 2001). The San Joaquin Elementary School has experienced a reduction in enrollment since the beginning of the current school year and enrollment is not expected to increase significantly in 2001/02.

Construction of CVEC will not cause significant population changes or housing impacts to the region. Most employees will commute to the site from areas within the County, as opposed to relocating to the area. As a result, CVEC construction will not cause any significant increase in demand for school services.

8.8.4.3.7 Impacts on Public Services and Facilities

The construction phases of the project may have minor impacts on police, fire, or hazardous materials handling resources. The Sheriff's department indicated some concerns about the possibility of impacts during the construction phase of the project. Lt. Huerta anticipates the need for additional law enforcement services for follow-up investigations as well as additional security during the weekends (Huerta, 2001). The Fire Department doesn't anticipate any significant impacts during the construction phase of the project (Williams, 2001). However, since these potential impacts to law enforcement services would be short-term and can be mitigated by the use of additional security, they are not considered significant. Copies of the records of conversation with the Sheriff and Fire departments are included in Appendix 8.8B. CVEC construction is not expected to create significant adverse impacts on medical resources in the area since minor injuries could be treated at the Valley Team Health Clinic in San Joaquin City and life-flight services are available from the University Medical Center, which has an adult trauma center.

8.8.4.3.8 Impacts on Utilities

CVEC construction will not make significant adverse demands on local water, sanitary sewer, electricity, or natural gas. Impacts will involve the extension of existing utility lines. Water requirements for construction are relatively insignificant. Given the number of workers and temporary duration of the construction period the impacts on the local sanitary sewer system would not be significant.

8.8.4.4 Operational Impacts

8.8.4.4.1 Operational Workforce

The proposed CVEC facility is expected to begin commercial operation in 2004. It is expected to employ up to 30 full-time employees. Anticipated job classifications are shown in Table 8.8-15. The entire permanent workforce is expected to commute from within Fresno County.

TABLE 8.8-15
Typical Plant Operation Workforce

Department	Personnel	Shift	Workdays
Operations	16 Operating Technicians, 1 Chemical Technician	Rotating 12-hour shift, 3 operators per shift, 3 relief operators	7 days a week
Maintenance	7 Maintenance Technicians (3 Mechanical, 1 Electrical, and 3 Instrumentation)	Standard 8-hour days	5 days a week (Maintenance technicians will also work unscheduled days and hours as required [weekends])
Administration	7 Administrators (1 Plant Manager, 1 Operations Manager, 1 Maintenance Manager, 1 Office Manager, 1 Plant Administrator, 1 Procurement Specialist, and 1 Plant Engineer)	Standard 8-hour days	5 days a week with additional coverage as required

Facility employees will be drawn from the local workforce and from existing Applicant staff. Consequently, only a slight increase in population is anticipated as a result of this project. There will be no significant impact on local employment.

8.8.4.4.2 Population Impacts

Some of the operational workforce may be drawn from the local population. However, it is anticipated that most of the operational workforce will be drawn from the cities of Fresno and Clovis in Fresno County as well as parts of Madera County or other neighboring counties.

8.8.4.4.3 Housing Impacts

Due to the few operations staff, significant impacts to housing are not anticipated. Hiring preferences will be given to workers living within the City of San Joaquin and Fresno County, thus minimizing the need for new housing. Based on the housing vacancy data in Table 8.8-6, there are approximately 19 available housing units within the City limits. Thus, some employees who need to relocate could choose to live within the City or within the County. Some may even want to have a new home built. However, the new demand for housing would not be significant.

8.8.4.4.4 Impacts to the Local Economy and Employment

CVEC operation will generate a small, permanent beneficial impact by creating employment opportunities for local workers through local expenditures for materials, such as office supplies and services. The average salary per operations employee is expected to be \$57,000 per year. For the assumed average of 30 full-time employees, this will result in an operation payroll of \$1.71 million per year. There will be an annual operations budget of approximately \$8 million, most of which is estimated to be spent locally, (i.e., within Fresno County). In addition, there will be an annual maintenance budget of approximately \$9.5 million. These additional jobs and spending will generate other employment opportunities and spending in the City of San Joaquin and Fresno County area. The addition of 30 full-time jobs would not significantly reduce unemployment rates.

Indirect and induced Economic Impacts from Operation

The operation of the proposed project would result in indirect and induced economic impacts that would occur within Fresno County depending on the point of sale. These indirect and induced impacts represent permanent increases in the county's economic variables. The indirect and induced impacts would result from annual expenditures on payroll as well as those on operations and maintenance (O&M).

Estimated indirect and induced employment within Fresno County would be 108 and 49 permanent jobs, respectively. These additional 157 jobs result from the \$19.21 million (\$1.71 million in payroll, \$8 million in materials and 9.5 million in operations) in annual operational budget. The operational phase employment multiplier is estimated at 6.2 (i.e., $[30 + 108 + 49]/30$) and is based on a Type SAM multiplier.

Indirect and induced income impacts are estimated at \$3,896,507 and \$1,233,701, respectively. The income multiplier associated with the operational phase of the project is approximately 1.3 (i.e., $[\$19,210,000 + \$3,896,507 + \$1,233,701]/\$19,210,000$) and is based on a Type SAM model.

8.8.4.4.5 Fiscal Impacts

The annual operations budget is expected to be approximately \$8 million, all of which it is assumed would be spent locally within Fresno County. In addition, there will be an annual maintenance budget of approximately \$9.5 million. As stated in the impacts to the economy subsection, CVEC will bring \$1.71 million in operational payroll to the region.

CVEC is expected to bring both sales tax and property tax revenue to Fresno County. In Fresno County, the County Assessor's Office is responsible for evaluating the market value of power-generating facilities. The Fresno County Assessor's Office uses a combination of three approaches (Downum, 2001) to assess the market value of a facility and thus assess the associated property taxes: (1) the cost approach (i.e., the cost to build CVEC until the point when it is operational, including entrepreneurial profits); (2) the income-generating approach (i.e., CVEC's anticipated income-generating capability over time); and (3) the market sales approach (i.e., the market price of similar plants/facilities. The basic countywide property tax rate of 1.0 percent, plus any existing bonds or special assessments (no greater than 1.3 percent), will be applied to the estimated valuation. If the facility is assessed at \$600 million, the total property tax obligation will range from \$6 to \$7.8 million annually.

The County or City will not realize the \$6 to \$7.8 million in annual property tax revenue until construction is completed. Collected property taxes go to the state, where they are reallocated back to the cities, counties, and special districts. In Fresno County, 23.5 percent of the tax revenues is paid into the Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF), 13.9 percent is paid to cities, 34.9 percent goes to school districts, 17.1 percent is paid into the County general fund, 5.2 percent goes to community colleges, and the remaining 5.4 percent is split between County libraries and Fire Districts (Jones, 2001). Therefore, approximately \$1,026,000 (\$6 million * 0.171) will be paid to Fresno County's general fund. This amount is too small, when compared to the \$186 million in the County's 2001 property tax revenue, to be considered a significant increase in revenue to the County. However, approximately \$834,000 (\$6 million * 0.139) would go to the City annually. In FY 2000-01, the City received \$33,995 in property tax revenue and had total General Fund revenue of \$712,335. The addition of another \$834,000 in general fund revenue would more than double the existing General Fund revenue and, therefore, would have a ***significant beneficial impact*** to the City.

During operations, additional sales tax revenues will be obtained by the City of San Joaquin and Fresno County. Increased payroll will be \$1.71 million annually, and additional O&M expenses will be approximately \$17.5 million annually. Assuming local expenditures of \$5 million annually, the estimated sales taxes will be approximately \$400,000. Of this amount, the place of sale will receive

\$50,000 in sales tax revenue. Assuming 75 percent of the sales will be outside the City of San Joaquin, the overall anticipated increase in sales and property tax revenue will be beneficial but not significant since it would constitute such a small percentage of total County revenues. Assuming that 25 percent of the sales were made in the City, the City would receive \$12,500 in sales tax. This would amount to an increase of 6.7 percent of the Other Tax revenue. This would be a beneficial increase, but would not, by itself, be considered significant.

8.8.4.4.6 Impacts on Education

The schools in the Golden Plains Unified School District are currently not considered overcrowded. Even assuming that most of the 30 operational employees end up residing within the City of San Joaquin, CVEC operation is not expected to create any significant adverse impacts to the local school system. Assuming an average family size of 3.06 persons/household for Fresno County (DOF, 2001) would imply the addition of approximately 30 children to the local schools. This would constitute a 1.4 percent increase in school enrollment. Although minor adverse impacts could occur, any development (industrial or residential) within the Golden Plains Unified School District is currently charged a one-time assessment fee of \$1.91 per square foot of principal building area (Gonzales, 2001). Based on 10,200 square feet of occupied structures, CVEC will pay \$19,482 in school impact fees.

8.8.4.4.7 Impacts on Public Services and Facilities

Project operation will not make significant demands on public services or facilities even if all of the 30 operational employees decide to reside in the City of San Joaquin. The Sheriff's department did not express any concerns about needing increased services during plan operations (Huerta, 2001). Two 1.5-million-gallon (nominal capacity) onsite raw water storage tanks will be located at the project site. These tanks will include a minimum of 240,000 gallons of water dedicated to the fire protection system. The dedicated water supply is sized in accordance with NFPA 850 to provide 2 hours of fire protection. The Fire Department felt that impacts from plant operations would be minimal and would entail at most a change in the Department's Standard Response Plan (Williams, 2001). Copies of the records of conversation with the Sheriff and Fire departments are included in Appendix 8.8B. CVEC operation would not create significant adverse impacts on medical resources in the area due to the safety record of power plants and few operations staff

8.8.4.4.8 Impacts on Utilities

CVEC operation will not make significant adverse demands on local water, sanitary sewer, electricity, or natural gas because adequate supply and capacity currently exist.

8.8.5 Cumulative Impacts

Since both construction and operations personnel will reside primarily in the City of San Joaquin, or live within commuting distance, no adverse impact to local schools or housing is anticipated. No adverse cumulative socioeconomic impacts are anticipated from either the construction or operation of CVEC. Instead, the local community will enjoy a beneficial (but not significant) impact from short-term construction and longer-term operations employment. In addition, the long-term payment of taxes and fees are expected to have a significant beneficial impact to the City.

For additional cumulative impacts the reader is referred to Section 8.4, Land Use.

8.8.6 Environmental Justice

President Clinton's Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations" was signed on February 11, 1994. The purpose of this Executive Order is to identify and address whether adverse human health or environmental effects are likely to fall disproportionately on minority and/or low-income members of the community.

The federal guidelines set forth a three-step screening process:

1. Identify which impacts of the project are high and adverse
2. Determine if minority or low-income populations exist within the high and adverse impact zones
3. Examine the spatial distribution of high and adverse impact areas to determine if these impacts are likely to fall disproportionately on the minority and/or low-income population

According to the guidelines established by USEPA to assist federal agencies to develop strategies to address this circumstance, a minority and/or low-income population exists if the minority and/or low-income population percentage of the affected area is 50 percent or more of the area's general population. The guidance suggests using two or three standard deviations above the mean as a quantitative measure of disparate effects.

A screening-level analysis of Environmental Justice is presented in Appendix 8.8A. According to that analysis, this project does not create high and adverse impacts. Therefore, there are no environmental impacts that are likely to fall disproportionately on minority and/or low-income members of the community.

8.8.7 Mitigation Measures

1. Due to the high levels of unemployment in the City of San Joaquin, the Applicant will provide local hiring preferences to qualified individuals and will provide a preference for local procurement of materials and supplies within the City, then within the County unless to do so would: (1) violate federal or state statutes; or (2) the qualified personnel, materials, or supplies are not available.
2. The Applicant will pay the one-time statutory development fee as required at the time of filing for an in-lieu building permit with the City, which would include school impact fees.
3. The Applicant will provide onsite security and work with local law enforcement to address the need for any additional support during the construction phase.

8.8.8 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

Table 8.8-16 provides a list of agencies and contact persons of potentially responsible agencies. Copies of records of conversation are provided in Appendix 8.8B.

TABLE 8.8-16
Agencies and Agency Contacts for CVEC Socioeconomics

Agency	Contact/Title	Phone Number	Address
City of San Joaquin	Shahid Hami, City Manager	559-693-4311	P.O. Box 758 San Joaquin, CA 93660
Fresno County Office of the Assessor	Jeff Downum, Agricultural Appraiser	559-488-3509	P.O. Box 1146 Fresno, CA 93715
Golden Plains Unified School District	Patricia Gonzales, Superintendent's Assistant	559-693-1115	2200 Nevada Street San Joaquin, CA 93660
Fresno County Sheriff's Office	Lt. Dave Huerta, Area Commander, Area 1	559-693-2437	21925 W. Manning San Joaquin, CA 93669

TABLE 8.8-16
Agencies and Agency Contacts for CVEC Socioeconomics

Agency	Contact/Title	Phone Number	Address
Fresno County Fire Department	Cary Williams Captain, FCFPD Station No. 95 Doug Johnson Engineer, FCFPD Station No. 95	559-698-5500	25101 W. Morton Tranquillity, CA 93668
Fresno County Office of Education	Marcelino Gonzales, Business Manager, Golden Plains Unified School District	559-693-1115	2200 Nevada Street San Joaquin, CA 93660
Fresno County Office of the Assessor	Bob Jones, Principal Accountant, Special Accounting Division	559-488-3491	P.O. Box 1247 Fresno, CA 93715-1247
Fresno County Office of the Tax Collector	Laurie Poindexter, Account Clerk	559-488-3482	P O Box 1192 Fresno, CA 93715

8.8.9 Permits and Permitting Schedule

Permits dealing with the effects on public services are addressed as part of the building permit process. For example, school development fees are typically collected when the Applicant pays in-lieu building permit fees to the City. These permits are addressed in Table 8.4-4 in the Land Use section and listed in Appendix 1E. No permits are required to comply with the socioeconomic impacts of the project.

8.8.10 References

California Board of Equalization (BOE). 2001. General Information Line (Tel: 559-248-4219). May 16.

California Employment Development Department (CEDD). 2001a. Annual Average Labor Force Data for Sub-County Areas. Internet site: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/lftable.htm>

California Employment Development Department (CEDD). 2001b. Internet sites: <http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov>; <http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov/htmlfile/subject/COsnaps.html>; <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/indtable.html>.

California Department of Finance (DOF). 2001. Financial and Economic data. California County Profiles. Internet sites: www.dof.ca.gov/html/fs-data/profiles/pf-home.htm, <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/2000Cover.html>.

California Department of Finance (DOF). 1998. County Population Projections with Race/Ethnic Detail Estimated 1990 through 2040. Internet site: http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograph/Proj_race.html.

City of San Joaquin. 2001. Fast Facts – Demographic Information on San Joaquin. Internet site: <http://www.fresnocog.org/city/sanjoa1.html>.

City of San Joaquin. 2000. Adopted budget for Fiscal Year 2000/2001. August 15.

City of San Joaquin. 1999. Adopted budget for Fiscal Year 1999/2000.

Downum, Jeff. 2001. Appraiser, Fresno County Office of the Assessor. Personal Communication. May 18.

Fresno County. 2000. Public Review Draft General Plan Document. January.

Fresno County. 2001. County Budget for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2001.

Gonzales, Patricia. 2001. Assistant to Superintendent of Schools, Golden Plains Unified School District. Personal Communication. May 17.

Gonzales, Marcelino. 2001. Business Manager, Golden Plains Unified School District. Personal Communication. May 17.

Hami, Shahid. 2001. Manager, City of San Joaquin. Personal Communication. October 1.

Huerta, Dave. 2001. Lieutenant, Fresno County Sheriff's Department. Personal Communication. May and October.

Johnson, Doug. 2001. Engineer, Fresno County Fire Protection District (FCFPD) Station No. 95. Personal Communication. October 2.

Jones, Bob. 2001. Principal Accountant, Special Accounting Division. Fresno County Assessor's Office. Personal Communication. May 17.

Maggiore, Pam. 2001. Fresno City & County Convention & Visitors Bureau. Personal Communication. May 17.

Palada, Cecilia. 2001. California Department of Finance. Personal Communication. May 23.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1996. Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses, July 12, 1996.

Williams, Cary. 2001. Captain, Fresno County Fire Protection District (FCFPD) Station No. 95. Personal Communication. May.